



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,449	05/03/2001	Yuping Ambuel	700399.90126	7215

7590

11/08/2002

Nicholas J. Seay  
Quarles & Brady LLP  
1 South Pinckney Street  
P O Box 2113  
Madison, WI 53701-2113

EXAMINER

LILLING, HERBERT J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/848,449

Applicant(s)

AMBUEL ET AL.

Examiner

HERBERT J LILLING

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 10-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the election response filed October 02, 2002.
2. Claims 1-30 remain in the instant application.
3. Applicant has elected with traverse Group I, claims 1-9, drawn to a reaction mixture for performing protein synthesis.

Claims 10-30 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6, dated October 02, 2002.

The arguments have been deemed not to be persuasive to withdraw the restriction requirements. Applicant has argued that the only difference between Group II inventions from Group I inventions is that there is complete overlapping except for the vial or container. This argument is totally in error, as Group II requires that the extract is a fractionated extract and the two inventions do not completely overlap.

The restriction has been made **Final**.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1651

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the specific extract as prepared on page 12 [0042-0045], does not reasonably provide enablement for the claimed product without being in complete compliance with the following paragraphs as to the enabling and written descriptions. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, see the following paragraphs:

The enablement as well as the written description of the instant specification lack support for the claimed ingredients

**The specification lacks adequate written description** for the claimed inventions in view of the following points in accordance with the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize what is claimed with respect to the claimed "extract" in the expression "prokaryotic S-30 extract". Thus, an applicant must comply with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

Art Unit: 1651

An adequate written description of the ingredients requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it.

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372- 73 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, **in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, that is the "extract", is not a description of that material.** Applicant is required to give the structure of the extract or ingredients in the extract for an appropriate search and examination of the claimed extract.

Thus, Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The broad generic claim lacks sufficient description to inform a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing since the specification lacks a sufficient number of species which have been described by complete structure or sufficient identifying characteristics as to the scope of the claimed extract, thus the description requirement has not been satisfied.

### **AND**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The language of the claims must make it clear what subject matter the claims encompass to adequately delineate their "metes and bounds" as to the claimed "extract". See, e.g., the following decisions: **In re Hammack**, 427 F.2d. 1378, 1382, 166 USPQ 204, 208 (CCPA 1970); **In re Venezia** 530 F.2d. 956, 958, 189 USPQ 149,

Art Unit: 1651

151 (CCPA 1976); In re Goffe, 526 F 2d. 1393, 1397, 188 USPQ 131, 135 (CCPA 1975); In re Watson, 517 F 2d. 465, 477, 186 USPQ 11, 20 (CCPA 1975); In re Knowlton 481 F 2d. 1357, 1366, 178 USPQ 486, 492 (CCPA 1973). The courts have also indicated that before claimed subject matter can properly be compared to the prior art, it is essential to know what the claims do in fact cover. See, e.g., the following decisions: In re Steele, 305 F 2d. 859, 134 USPQ 292 (CCPA 1962); In re Moore 439 F 2d. 1232, 169 USPQ 236 (CCPA 1969); In re Merat, 519 F 2d. 1390, 186 USPQ 471 (CCPA 1975).

As indicated above, the term "extract" in the expression "prokaryotic S-30 extract" lacks sufficient information as to the scope of the claimed "extract" for a proper search and examination of the claimed inventions. This Examiner has indicated in the previous office action as to this search and examination that cannot be properly made for the claimed inventions.

Claims 1-9 fail to comply with the above decisions.


Absent amendments in complete compliance the withdrawal of the above rejections, Applicant will have the right to go to the Board of Appeals to overcome the above rejections.

6. No search and examination of the claimed mixture can be properly be made as noted above.

Art Unit: 1651

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Examiner Lilling whose telephone number is (703) 308-2034** and **Fax Number** is for applications **Before Final** (703) 872-9306 and **After Final** for applications is 703-872-9307 or SPE Michael Wityshyn whose telephone number is (703) 308-4743. Examiner can be reached Monday-Thursday from about 5:30 A.M. to about 3:00 P.M. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

H.J.Lilling: HJL  
(703) 308-2034  
Art Unit 1651  
November 07, 2002

  
Dr. Herbert J. Lilling  
Primary Examiner  
Group 1600 Art Unit 1651